

forward. I think that it is...it is instructive for us to know that the natural...or the Nebraska Association of Resource Districts came in and testified in support of this bill, that is the original bill, for the first time in memory. So I think that gradually the public opinion on this is shifting. And it was my...my belief, if the only thing that we could do is change one district, that we ought to go with that. If there is a move on this floor to...to undo the amendment, frankly, I don't know what I'll do because I would...I would definitely be in favor of that direction. But, like the rest of the committee, I voted for the amendment and sent it out to the floor. With that explanation, I would just like to...like to say I think that...that we need to do this and we need to do it throughout the whole state, if at all possible. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I strongly oppose this amendment. And I would say in contrast to being a baby step, it may be more like a giant step, primarily because it selects one district, picks one district out. And I...I have no particular problem with the long range of going to more closely oriented...closely connected with the population base. But to make this step at this point with just one district, I think, really makes no sense. I think we ought to consider natural resources districts also have more to do with land and geography as...as much as it does with people also. So I don't really see a reason to hurry this along. I realize the Supreme Court has said that we eventually have to go one to one, or that's the goal, and I have no problem with gradually moving toward that. But seems to me when you consider the land treatment, the geography of the area, the large land area which is the base for NRDs, I can't really see doing the...moving too rapidly in the first place, in the second place doing this just piecemeal, in this case picking out one NRD with a primary class city in this case. So I strongly oppose this. I think you ought to consider very carefully what we're doing here. If we are going to move along toward this let's do it uniformly across the state. If you think there's a need to hurry it up, then let's use different basis on the ratios, use the ratios on a gradually changing basis for all. But let's not pick out one district in this case without taking into account what the effect of it will be on all the other districts across the state. Let's...let's keep it...let's keep our sanity in all of this and realize instead of making a baby step, I think we're